

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN
Editor and Proprietor
RICHARD L. METCALFE
Associate Editor

CHARLES W. BRYAN
Publisher
Editorial Rooms and Business
Office, 324-326 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
Six Months......50
In Clubs of Five or
more, per year... .75

Three Months..... .25
Single Copy..... .05
Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Post, 5c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus 1912. Two weeks are required after money has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1912, means that payment has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

Signs of the Times

Mr. Bryan celebrated St. Patrick's Day at Milwaukee as the guest of the Hibernian society. His subject was, "The Signs of the Times." Speaking of the Irish race, he said:

"I have enough Irish in me to make me proud of the blood and not enough to make my praise of the race seem self-praise. The Irish strain is one of the strongest that has entered into the mixture of nationalities here. None of those who have come from across the ocean have shown themselves more versatile in talent or more adaptable to conditions. The Irish have distinguished themselves in every walk in life. They have been especially prominent in great contests, both on the battlefield and in the forum. No element in our population has shown such a capacity for politics—no element has given more eminent orators to the pulpit and to public life.

"What is it that makes the Irishman so virile and so aggressive? Allow me to mention two things that in my judgment, tend to account for his strength and prominence. First, the Irishman is a religious man—he is a man of faith. To him life is not a game of chance; it is a divine plan and he is a part of the plan. He believes that there is a God back of the universe—a God whose arm is strong enough to bring victory to every righteous cause. Faith is the spiritual extension of the vision beyond what the eye can see or the mind can grasp. No man can be a great fighter in civic contests or in war without faith. "Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel just." A second source of strength to the Irishman is his home life. In no home does woman occupy a more influential position than in the Irish home. The wife is a full partner with the husband; the mother as potential a factor as the father in all that concerns the household. Let a man have a home for a citadel and he is strong to face the world."

Speaking of home rule, Mr. Bryan said:

"Home rule is in sight—it can not much longer be delayed. When you meet next year you can rejoice over the passage of the home rule bill and, as the house of lords can not obstruct now for more than two years, you can, three years from now, celebrate the ending of the long struggle and the triumph of the movement to which so many Irishmen have devoted their lives. And it doubtless interests you to observe how Ireland's fight for justice has linked her people to the common people of the world in their warfare against hereditary rule. Had the house of lords of Great Britain consented to home rule when Gladstone won his fight in the house of commons it would still be exercising a veto power, but its refusal to permit the passage of the home rule measure was one of the chief causes of its degradation. Public sentiment finally compelled the house of lords to consent to the curtailment of its authority and when the house of lords fell its fall shook every hereditary body on the earth. All, therefore, who fight for popular government are indebted

The Commoner.

VOLUME 12, NUMBER 14

to Ireland for the aid her sons have rendered the world-wide cause of freedom."

THE LESSON TO DEMOCRATS IN NORTH DAKOTA PRIMARY

There is in the North Dakota primary result a political lesson that should be heeded by the democrats of Ohio and of the nation. It is one that should be so deeply impressed upon them that they will avoid the certainty of defeat which faces any party that will place in nomination for the presidency one who failed to enforce the anti-trust law when in position to end the trust question.

An attorney of the corporations would be delighted to nullify that law, but the people will have none of that nor give him an opportunity to repeat as president his treatment of the law while attorney general of the United States.

In La Follette's tour of the state prior to the primary his strong argument against Colonel Roosevelt's candidacy was his lack of energy in prosecution of violators of that law when he was in office and possessed the power through the department of justice to do so. Here we have in the very first contest of the republican party the voters of that party choosing for their candidate the man who is most radical in his views of enforcement of that anti-trust law, who condemns Colonel Roosevelt for too much moderation in his execution of its provisions, and who, as a republican, finds a most emphatic indorsement of his anti-trust position by the voters, despite the efforts of the friends of Colonel Roosevelt and President Taft to exhibit their vigorous efforts to enforce the law.

Does any democrat in Ohio or in the country believe that the democrats of this state or the other states are any less desirous of the enforcement of that law than are the republicans of North Dakota?

Senator Pomerene stated but lately that the department of justice of the United States by vigorous enforcement of that law, in his opinion, could have put the trust question out of existence.

If the senator is right in this opinion his indictment of the attorney generals who have served since the enactment of that law is soundly based, and applies to every man who presided over the department of justice during that period.

Democrats know that the department of justice under Colonel Roosevelt's administration was far more strenuous in its attempts to enforce the anti-trust law than it was when presided over by a democrat, whose name is now pressed as a presidential candidate.

The people of the country know that under President Taft's administration suits have been numerous, indictments many and convictions more than a few.

It seems most absurd for democrats in any state to think they can face the voters successfully against either Taft, Colonel Roosevelt or La Follette if they should name as their presidential candidate one who made a record in the department of justice upon this very law, and that record a failure to vigorously enforce it, a failure to protect the interests of the people by such enforcement.

The campaign would be decided against such candidate from the very moment of his nomination. It would be decided against the democratic party and against thousands of democrats, candidates for other offices, who would be buried under an avalanche of defeat.

No man who considered the anti-trust law a dead letter can be elected president of the United States this year.—Cincinnati Enquirer.

THE PROGRESSIVE DELEGATES IN NEBRASKA

The following delegates-at-large and in the districts, represent progressive sentiment and favor the nomination of a progressive democrat for president on a progressive platform. They are opposed to surrendering the party into the control of the predatory interests:

Delegates-at-Large—Judge G. L. Loomis, I. J. Dunn, Judge W. H. Westover, W. J. Bryan. First District Delegates—A. S. Tibbetts, W. D. Wheeler.

Second District Delegates—C. J. Smyth, J. W. Woodrough.

Third District Delegates—W. H. Green, Louis Lightner, W. J. McVicker.

Fourth District Delegates—C. E. Bowlby, Matt Miller.

Fifth District Delegates—P. W. Shea, Frank P. Swanson.

Sixth District Delegates—Frank Taylor, Orin Reed, Jas. W. Finnegan, George C. Gillan.

Practical Tariff Talks

The cause of high protection received another rude shock when the woolen millowners of Lawrence endeavored to shift the burden of cost of a shorter working week for women upon the shoulders of the employees. Protection, we have been told so often, was for the benefit of American labor. But the Lawrence trouble developed the interesting fact that in the woolen industry, sheltered under the heaviest protection afforded by the Payne-Aldrich law, there wasn't any American labor—that the men, women and children employed in these great mills, marking the center of the greatest woolen goods production in the country, were not Americans at all, but French-Canadians, a few English and the remainder from the countries of southern Europe.

Men who have kept tab upon the great manufacturing interests of the country have been aware that in the last decade or two the American stock, later supplemented by Irish, Germans, Welsh and Scandinavians, had been giving way almost entirely to the cheaper labor from the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. But the general public, especially the people of the middle west, have not been aware of the tremendous extent to which this development has grown, but they know now—the Lawrence lock-out showed them the facts. For twelve years cheap foreign labor has been imported into this country at the rate of a million a year, and it was brought for the express purpose of competing with, and, therefore, reducing or holding in check the wages of American workmen. So great has been this influx that in at least a dozen of the great manufacturing industries of the country, these emigrants have usurped at least 50 per cent of the jobs. In the woolen industry the percentage is greater.

When any high protectionist, in the coming campaign, attempts to justify the present tariff law on the ground that it insures employment at good wages to American labor, point him to Lawrence where, in the mills of the woolen trust, he will find only a very small percentage of Americans at work, and average wages to adults of from \$6 to \$8 a week, depending upon whose figures are accepted, the strikers or the employers! Labor is admitted free of duty. American labor must compete with the labor of all the world. The protection is for the manufacturers. They say that if the tariff is made lower or if there be free trade, they will have to go out of business, because under those conditions they would have to compete with the pauper labor of Europe employed in the factories of Europe. Under this plea they have been given high protection—especially the woolen manufacturers—and having got it they send over and bring the pauper laborers whose competition they so much feared to work for them, at the wages fixed by them.

This can not be justified on the ground that these foreigners go into the melting pot from which emerges the American citizen. For the truth is that many of these men do not come for citizenship, but for gain. They plan to live as cheaply as possible, and if they can get a little money ahead go back again. The records of the big steamship companies show that many thousands of these men from Italy and the Balkans and Poland return each year. Their brief stay, the object of their coming and the wages they receive combine to drive them to a standard of living that is not American.

And what is this share that the workmen in the woolen mills gets in the toll levied on the clothing wearers of the country? Let the census statistics answer: The labor cost of producing the \$420,000,000 worth of woolen goods in 1909 was \$80,000,000, less than 20 per cent. The tariff rates ran from 45 to 155 per cent. The value added by manufacture, which means the value of the product less the cost of material, was \$146,000,000. Of this \$146,000,000 the manufacturers gave labor \$80,000,000 and kept \$66,000,000. Their total investment was but \$415,000,000. The figures relating to value of products represents the products actually turned out, and does not of necessity have any relation to the amount of sales for that year.

C. Q. D.